

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 93 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #270
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 29 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 270

Today's Topics:

 ARRL and it's members (3 msgs)
 ARRL opposes temporary permits
 Call sign snobbery (2 msgs)
 STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
 TS50 as CB (Re: TS50 Illegal!)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 28 Jul 93 09:32:18 EDT
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
>jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (Jon Gefaell) writes:
>
>
>I think your first mistake was to write to Luck Hurder in the first
>place. In all the times I've tried to reach him, I have been out of luck
>(with no pun intended).
>

Yah? Pretty odd, given that I respond to every single piece of
input, whether it be paper or electronic that comes my way.

Care to try to solve the problem rather than trying to indicate
to a bejillion people that you're simply out of luck?

By the way, my mamma didn't say whether it was good or bad. Luck that is!

```
|           |   |           Deputy Manager, Field Services, ARRL.  
|           |___|           The ARRL Amateur Radio Emergency Service, the ARRL  
| luck      |   |urder      National Traffic System, The Amateur Auxiliary to  
-----|   |           the FCC's Field Operations Bureau, the ARRL  
          |   |           Field Organization and the ARRL Monitoring System.
```

lhurder@arrl.org Prodigy - MGTS39A, BIX - ARRL,
MCI Mail - RPALM, MCI Mail - "ARRL", America On Line - "ARRL HQ"
Compuserve - 70007,3373 (ARRL HQ) -- Genie ARRL.HQ

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 17:33:21 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
squam.banyan.com!banyan.com!dts@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <24i97B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)
writes:
|> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:
|>
|> > This whining that the League doesn't represent it's members is the same
|> > as people who don't vote whining that congress doesn't represent them either.
|>
|> I vote, Ron, but I certainly don't pay \$30.00 a year for the privilege!

No, you pay a whole lot more. Probably 28% or more of your salary... Remember
taxes?

|>
|> --Robert

--

Daniel Senie Internet: dts@questar.banyan.com
Banyan Systems, Inc. Compuserve: 74176,1347
508-898-1188 Packet Radio: N1JEB@KA1SRD.MA

Date: 28 Jul 93 19:06:33 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!umn.edu!msc.edu!apctrc!zslf08@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <V9ND8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

> I think your first mistake was to write to Luck Hurder in the first
> place. In all the times I've tried to reach him, I have been out of luck
> (with no pun intended).

I've asked Luck for information on several occasions, and received prompt, courteous, helpful replies. And I've reason to believe that I'm not alone in this experience. If you've had a problem, why automatically assume that the fault lies with the other person? Could be **your** problem.

Good Luck (pun intended),

Steve WA5RPF

Date: 28 Jul 93 14:46:41 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL opposes temporary permits
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, eubanks@mitre.org (Vern Eubanks) writes:

>In article <1850@arrl.org> jlbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:
>> In rec.radio.amateur.policy, flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd
>[Phoenix SE]) writes:
>> >In article <1801@arrl.org> jlbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:
>> >>In rec.radio.amateur.misc, flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com
>> >(Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:
>>
>> [previous discussion of policy-by-poll deleted]
>
>Puhleezz ! Let us stick to the subject!!!!
>^^^^^^^^^^
>Fred started off with a re-trans of the bulletin that said ...ARRL
>(directors) voted to not endorse a temporary permits (actually did the
>bulletin say temporary, I thought the bulletin indicated permanent
>licenses?).
>
>That's the issue!

Well, sometimes threads wander off onto other subjects.

>Somebody (John?, Al?) please get this thread back on the subject and tell
>us masses -
>
>1) What did the directors specifically do? (temporary permits/permanent
>licenses)

They directed ARRL's General Counsel to file comments opposing any attempt by any authority, other than FCC, to provide a point-of-examination temporary operating authority. At the same time, they committed League support for FCC efforts to implement electronic filing of license/upgrade applications.

>2) How close the vote? Was the vote because of computer
>security/interoperability issues (plenty apply)?

I don't know the vote. Presumably the decision was based on the potential for abuse, but I don't know the specifics of the discussion.

>3) What plans does the League have for reducing the exam-to-transmit delay?

For one thing, to work with the FCC to get electronic filing implemented. That should reduce the delays all along the processing path. (I've not heard any specific estimates.)

>4) If the directors believe there is no grass roots interest in this
>pressing issue, please register this electronic vote in disagreement.

I very much doubt that they believe there is a lack of interest!

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 15:06:34 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!
news.iastate.edu!IASTATE.EDU!wjturner@ames.arpa
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2363kc\$ibr@senator-bedfellow.MIT.EDU>, drt@athena.mit.edu (David R Tucker) writes:

Thank you for the explanation. However, I think you're math is off also. M is 7 units long (3+1+3), not 9. Thus:

>

> N7WIM = 5+3 + 13+3 + 9+3 + 3+3 + 9+7 = 58
>

should be:

N7WIM = 5+3 + 13+3 + 9+3 + 3+3 + 7+7 = 56

--
Will Turner, NORDV
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: 28 Jul 1993 10:51:32 -0700
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@athena.mit.edu (David R Tucker) writes:

>In article <9307280120.AA01327@netmail.microsoft.com>, you write:
>|>
>|> I say:
>|>
>|> N7WIM = 5 + 3 + 13 + 3 + 9 + 3 + 4 + 3 + 7 = 50 units
>|>
>|> But, Mr Pelican, I have one of those crummy 1 + 3 calls ... but I don't
>|> think I'll change it!
>|>
>|> Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP
>|> a-kevinp@microsoft.com
>|> Sit simplex, stulte!

>N7WIM = 5+3 + 13+3 + 9+3 + 3+3 + 9+7 = 58

>No word is odd, but no character or space is even. (where'd you get 4??) You have
>to include the word space at the end. PARIS, the "standard word", is 50.
>KG2S is 54. (JY1 is 56!) ...

May I humbly suggest a possibly less confusing (and position-independent)
way of counting?

- 1) All dots, whether in the middle or the tail of a character, count as 2 units.
- 2) All dashes, whether in the middle or the tail of a character, count as 4 units.
- 3) Each character, including the last character of a word, count as 2 units (the extra 1 unit already accounted for by the trailing dot or dash),
- 4) Each word count as 4 units (the trailing character of a word has taken care of the extra 2 units).

Ergo:

Count all the dots in the text, multiply by 2;
Count all the dashes, multiply by 4;
Count the number of characters, multiply by 2;
Count the number of words, multiply by 4.
Sum.

For example, HS1A => 9 dots, 5 dashes, 4 characters, 1 word =>
 $9 \times 2 + 5 \times 4 + 4 \times 2 + 1 \times 4 = 50$. (Doesn't pay to be a king, eh? :-).

BTW, the above algorithm is another confirmation of David's statement that all words must yield even units of a dot time.

73 (=28 units :-),

Kok Chen, AA6TY (=56 units) kchen@apple.com
Apple Computer, Inc.

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 15:34:02 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!linus!
linus.mitre.org!mitre.org!eubanks@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <235mrpINNnr2@sweetpea.genrad.com> dls@genrad.com (Diana L. Carlson) writes:
> rec.radio.amateur.misc:45001

> >I would like to see a VE-issued, temporary callsign that allows
operation
> >at the earned level of achievement, or a subset - say just VHF

privileges,

> >until the actual ticket arrives. The callsigns could be of a unique
> >format, something like "WT9876AB"; where "WT" or "WN" correspond to Tech
or
> >Novice; "9876" corresponds to a specific VE session & is assigned in
> >blocks by the VEC organization. The format provides an expiration
code
> >derived from the specific VE session - say, the last day of the 3rd
month
> >following the session. The local examiners retain the particulars on
the
> >call/name/address/date. Another format is fine if there's a problem
with
> >this one.

>

> Actually, I think a system similar to this is being considered. In a
recent
> W5YI Report (one of the most useful ham publications I receive, sorry
ARRL,
> I like QST too, but I read W5YI Report as soon as I get it), there was an
> article about the system that the FCC is looking at. Generally, once
the
> person passed and had a CSCE in his possession, he could actually USE the
> license immediately. The temporary callsign would be two letters (like
KN)
> followed by the number for his group (ie, 1 in MA, 9 in IN, etc),
followed
> by his three initials. So, as an example, mine would be something like
> KN1DLS (or KN1DLC, if you want to get real picky....).

>

> I haven't heard yet if/when this will be implemented, but there were
indications
> that it could happen as soon as the fall time.

>> Diana L. Carlson

> --

> ->Diana L. (Syriac) Carlson dls@genrad.com Ham: KC1SP (Sweet Pea)
Diana,

My objection to that format is that it would require on-line tracking to
ensure there was no contention for already issued calls. Also, if it is
to be a temporary callsign (my assumption - everything must be temporary
until the FCC gets directly into the process) then you would use up a
potentially effective (permanent) callsign for a temporary one. Now take
that same format, but then make it 3 alpha characters before the number
and that problem goes away, but you still have duplicates within the
numbered zone. I prefer a completely different format for temporary
calls to avoid possible duplication/callsign contention and without having
to access an on-line database. There are lots of problems with that.

We could have several KN1DLC's (your temporary call, but also Donald Lawrence

Collins) at one time.
Vern, AA7EI

These are my personal opinions only.

Date: 28 Jul 93 13:36:54 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
umn.edu!msc.edu!raistlin!timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!
dadams@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: TS50 as CB (Re: TS50 Illegal!)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 46087B6w165w@nraven.wariat.org, floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever)
writes:

|mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salzyzn) writes:

|
|> dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:
|>
|> >I wish the rule were ammended to allow licenced Amateurs the privelege to
|> >use 11 meters (as secondary users, of course) also allowing them to
|> >contact other legitimate users of those frequencies. (In other words
|> >I think that it is really silly to have to have two radios in the car
|> >to work 10 and 11 meters. If the TS-50 can do both, why not allow it
|> >to do so if the user is a licenced Ham as long as he abides the 4 watt
|> >pep rule etc?
|>
|> The chance for abuses are extreme here, a CBer now can more legitimately
|> own an Amateur Radio to 'typically' use on 11M (but typically abuse on any
|> frequency he feels fit to open up ...). Part of Type acceptance is to
|> channelize the rig so it is idiot proof, I doubt that any Amateur would
|> even use a Amateur Radio 'legitimately' on CB (power, frequency, et al)
|> since the 11M band is hardly a gentleman's band (neither is 14.313).
|>
|> Now, just image the manufacturers making a Type Accepted Amateur Radio
|> Rig that automatically is legal (channelized, 4W, VFO and XIT off) to operate
|> on CB as well ... the petty fights between 'natural' Amateurs and
|> 'CB' grown Amateurs just grew one notch ...
|>
|

| Amen! I mean, if you already have the ham gear, talk to the
|hams, they're more fun, more amusing, heck, if you really get into it,
|they'rse even worse than the CBers. (14.313) <Man I love my reciever, I
|can hear HF Amateur Radio at it's finest. :(> In fact, you could
|probably just pitch the Childrens Band rig altogether.. unless of course
|you'd rather make lots of noise into a mic. instead of having a
|conversation with one.

|
|73 de N8VUR

Well I think you missed the point here! (And the scenario that was deleted from the above.) Presumably if you are a Ham it is because you appreciate talking to hams and using ham privileges more than CB. I know that hams generally

look down on CB, and often justifiably so given all the crap that goes on there, However there clearly are situations where you might still want to be able to use CB, for example I gave the scenario where you are traveling cross country with other family members or friends who do not have ham licences. They talk to each other with CB equipment. If you want to join in legally you have to have two radios. I think that is silly! I would only want to be able to use the privilege for a couple of days a year.

Clearly if you come upon a situation where human life or property is in danger you are allowed to use your TS-50 as a CB to contact CBers. I don't think it should have to come to that.

Hams are often allowed secondary privileges in other bands. Sure there are details that would have to be hammered out, like power limits etc., but it could be done without disrupting the CB band.

David, NOWWN/AA

November Zero Whiskey Whiskey November

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

-Sourdough and Ham-

- Minnesotans for Global Warming! -

(&gardner)

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 16:35:03 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
squam.banyan.com!banyan.com!dts@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul21.153450.28504@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,

<22pn2h\$40j@techbook.techbook.com>,

<POPOVICH.93Jul26110609@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>

Subject : Re: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

|>

|> ...

|> Given the relative performances of the VEC and the DXCC Desk lately,

|> it seems that either the VEC staffers have been working on DXCC, or
|> they've been spending a lot of their time making STRONG coffee to keep
|> those DXCC guys working. :-) Congratulations to the League on clearing
|> the DXCC backlog; now, how about clearing the license backlog?

|> Then,
|> if they'd only send some of that coffee to the NYC/LI Section Manager
|> to get him to answer his mail more often than once every couple of
|> months...:-) [Is this a common problem with SCMs? Volunteering and
|> then deciding they don't want the job?]

Vote for someone else next time, or better yet, run for the job yourself! I have decided to do just that up here in Western Massachusetts. I'd like to see better communications among the members of the sections and have ideas on how to do that. Therefore, I decided to take a crack at it myself. If I win, it'll mean a big time commitment, but it is for a good cause, IMHO.

Dan Senie N1JEB

|> then deciding they don't want the job?]
|>
|> -Steve, WB3I

--

Daniel Senie Internet: dts@questar.banyan.com
Banyan Systems, Inc. CompuServe: 74176,1347
508-898-1188 Packet Radio: N1JEB@KA1SRD.MA

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 16:58:30 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAExp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu>,
<1993Jul27.183222.24223@Csli.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Jul28.003259.18203@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code)

In <1993Jul28.003259.18203@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:
>In article <1993Jul27.183222.24223@Csli.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csli.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>>CW is one the most dominant modes on the Satellites, and by far the easiest
>>to gear for.
>Not if you are using the microsats for packet.

Hmmm, to work FO-20 on Wednesdays, all I need is a pair of non synthesized VXO rigs, and maybe a small brick. Otherwise, I need a synthesized RX (for the doppler adjustment), a modem, TNC, and a pc. The cost per ground station is about double that for the LEO linear transponder birds. In any event, the user population on OSCAR 13 appears to be much larger.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: 28 Jul 93 14:28:15 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!raistlin!timbuk.cray.com!walter.cray.com!
rps@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul27.183222.24223@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Jul28.003259.18203@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<1993Jul28.165830.477@Csl.Stanford.EDU>om
Subject : nocode started when?

I was just wondering when the nocode technician class
licensing started? Month ??, 198? (or 199?)

```
1\\//\\1
1      1
1      1 1
1 (.) (.) 1      / Russ Starksen \
C      _ )1__    /  NOMRR          \
1 ,__1 1##1---<  "Minnesota      / rps@cray.com
1 /      1*1    \  Radio Russ"    /
/---\      1__1    \  ___... ___ /  NOMRR @ KB0GF.MN.USA.NOAM
/      \
```

Date: Wed, 28 Jul 1993 17:18:17 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!
paulf@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <231qfnINNsgp@kralizec.zeta.org.au>,
<1993Jul27.123854.29419@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, <1993Jul27.162701.155753@locus.com>
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

In <1993Jul27.162701.155753@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers)

writes:

>The anti-no-code lot overlooks the purpose of the US amateur radio service
>as spelled out in CFR 47 Part 97.1. I quoted the entire section in a
>recent posting, so I'm not going to type it in again.

That's good, because 47 CFR 97.1 doesn't define the amateur service any
more than the Constitution defines the United States. Ham radio existed long
before Part 97, in fact long before the Communications Act of 1934 which
created the FCC.

>Now that CW is declining in popularity among commercial and military
>operations, it is time to ask the question "How can amateur radio
>continue to provide a reserve of valuable radio operators?".

The only relevant metric is whether the skill is still in significant use
in the service in question -- the Amateur Service. It is. QED.

--

-Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #270
